

REMARKS

The Official Action of March 9, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-17, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-17 remain in the application for consideration.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng '903, claims 3, 4 and 6-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng '903 in view of Chen '408 and Kusano '414, and claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Chen '045. Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections as applied to the claims as amended.

In the claimed invention, the thin face plate 40 which is fixed on the front side of the head body by solder, entirely covers the front edge of the shoulder portion of the head body out to the outer perimeter of the head body. In comparison, the front member 30 of Cheng '903 is embedded in the same recess as the rear member 32. This structural

Appl. No. 10/791,705
Amdt. dated July 11, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

difference leads to better flexibility and support of face plate 40 when head body 10 of the claimed invention strikes a ball, than that of front member 30 when the golf club head 16 of Cheng '903 strikes a ball.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\bn\d\dire\chen407\pto\Amendment-A.doc